

Central Washington University ScholarWorks@CWU

All Master's Theses


Master's Theses

1969

Attitudes of Principals Concerning Their Role as a Result of Professional Negotiations in the State of Washington

Karl Michael Fankhuaser
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Other Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fankhuaser, Karl Michael, "Attitudes of Principals Concerning Their Role as a Result of Professional Negotiations in the State of Washington" (1969). *All Master's Theses*. 1164.
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/1164>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

89

ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING THEIR
ROLE AS A RESULT OF PROFESSIONAL
NEGOTIATIONS IN THE STATE
OF WASHINGTON

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

by

Karl Michael Fankhauser

August, 1969

LD

5771.31

F35

SPECIAL
COLLECTION

174338

Library
Central Washington
State College
Ellensburg, Washington

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

William G. Gaskell, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

George C. Grossman

Franklin D. Carlson

IN APPRECIATION

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. William Gaskell, Dr. George Grossman, and Dr. Frank Carlson, for their assistance in the preparation and reporting of this study. A special thanks to Dr. Gaskell, the chairman, for listening to all of the long distance phone calls.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my wife, Glenda, and our children, Dean and Lynda, without whose encouragement, support, and understanding this study would have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED	1
The problem	3
Statement of the problem	3
Importance of the study	3
Delimitations of the study	4
Assumptions	5
Definitions of terms used	5
Professional negotiations	5
Collective bargaining	6
Professional negotiations law	6
Professional organizations	6
Teacher militancy	7
Educational leader	7
Organization of the remainder of the study . .	7
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Significant historical factors	10
Legal status of principals	12
Arguments against principal's membership	
in all-inclusive negotiating units	15
Arguments favoring principal's membership	
in all-inclusive negotiating units	23

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY	29
Questionnaire design	29
Analysis procedure	31
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY	33
General information	33
Attitude information	42
Is the principal's role changing	48
How principal's role will change	50
Groups of principals most threatened	52
Direction for future role	53
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	56
Conclusions	58
Recommendations	59
Suggestions for further study	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	62
APPENDIX	67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Classification of Principals by Experience and Background	34
II. Number of Principals and the Size of District They Represented	36
III. Grade Level Reported by Principals for Their Building	37
IV. The Membership of Principals in Professional Organizations	38
V. Number of Principals with regard to Salary Representation, District Levy Failure, and Grievance Procedure	41
VI. Percentage Responses of Principals to Attitude Statements on Their Role and Professional Negotiations	43

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

The process of professional negotiations is having a profound effect and a tremendous impact on public education. The classroom teachers have been asserting a much greater influence on how the schools are to be run. Through organizational strength, the classroom teacher's involvement in policy and decision-making will continue and increase.

To some educators, the professional negotiations process is a perilous one, upsetting traditions and disrupting historically accepted practices. To others, professional negotiations is a great deliverance involving all professional school personnel in shaping the policy decisions which affect the instructional program, the conditions of work, and the entire educational situation.

With the passage of the Washington State Negotiations Law of 1965, several areas have been accepted as fact. The board of education is still charged with the responsibility of public education for a district. The chief administrator or superintendent has been accepted as representing the board and speaking for the board during negotiations. The law relates that teachers may or may not join a professional organization, but only one

organization may negotiate with the board.

The area that has had no direction as yet is the position of the building principal. Lloyd Michael suggests a very perilous position for the building principal as he works with his staff (30:107).

The greatest problem facing the secondary school principal today is his attempt to fulfill his role as an instructional leader and as a manager of change in his precarious and frequently untenable position caused by schism developing among teachers, boards of education, and chief administrators.... Teachers, in their attempt to bypass the superintendent, are either ignoring principals or are including them in negotiating agreements which severely limit administrative prerogatives previously within the province of the building administrator.

In their book, Grievances and Their Resolutions, Frank Lutz, Lou Kleiman, and Sy Evans have suggested the building principal's position is undergoing a complete alteration (27:79).

Traditionally, the principal has been thought of as the educational leader of his faculty, the final authority governing any matters taking place under the roof of his building, the master of his house. The relationship of the principal to the superintendent and that of his school to the district, could be thought of in an analogous sense, as a harmony-kingdom relationship. Each principal operated his building in a distinct and separate style, relatively free from the central office control Of late, it has become not uncommon for the building principals to think of themselves as the "odd men out."

As yet, there is no assumed role for the building principal as a result of the impact of professional negotia-

tions in the State of Washington. There are arguments that the principal is the right-hand-man of the superintendent, and as such, cannot be considered a partner with his staff because of a conflict of interests. For many years, the principal has enjoyed a position of partnership with his building staff. Others argue that, as leaders of the instructional program and educational innovator in their buildings, the principals are, in effect, head teachers and ought to speak with and for teachers. Still others contend that principals should speak only for principals. "At no previous time has the leadership responsibility of the principal been more crucial (35:63).

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study (1) to examine the attitudes of principals as to whether they saw their roles changing as a result of professional negotiations, (2) to show how the principals felt their roles would be changed, (3) to examine which type or group of principals felt most threatened by professional negotiations, and (4) what stratagem principals may follow in the future as a reaction to teacher militancy.

Importance of the study. Educators are vested with

the assumed and implied responsibility of providing a sound educational program for the youth of the State of Washington. If educators wish to obtain and maintain the status of professionalism, they must not lose sight of the objectives for which they are employed. All educators are charged with the welfare of their students. Criticism of educators has been heard in the form of weakness as a result of militancy taking the place of a sincere concern for the education of the youth. Principals must be alert to this excoriation and help guide their teachers as well as being involved in the process of professional negotiations.

Delimitations of the study. There was no attempt in this paper to compare the effectiveness of professional negotiations with collective bargaining. It was assumed that professional negotiations, as a result of the process of communication between teacher's organizations and boards of education, is an accomplished fact and likely to remain so.

It was accepted that nine out of ten teachers who join an educational organization belong to a National Education Association affiliate. It was also assumed that sooner or later all affiliates will have to come to grips with the professional negotiations process.

Only first-class district elementary and secondary principals were randomly selected and included in the study. October 26, 1968, was selected as the cut-off date for returning questionnaires to be tabulated.

Assumptions. For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. Those items included in the questionnaire were a fair and representative sample of the concerns of principals on matters dealing with professional negotiations.
2. Principals are in a unique position to appraise their roles since no criteria has been set.
3. Randomly selected principals from throughout the state would represent the concerns and interests of a majority of the principals in the State of Washington.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Professional negotiations. Throughout the report of this study, professional negotiations will refer to a set of procedures, written and officially adopted by the local association and the school board, which provides an orderly method to negotiate, through professional channels, on matters of mutual concern, to reach agree-

ments on these matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of impasse (31:unpaged).

Collective bargaining. This term has been used to describe a process which was designed to meet the needs of labor. It describes the relationship between labor and management in bargaining matters of mutual concern. It excluded the supervisors and management from the bargaining unit, provided for labor channels and arbitration routes, placed educational operations and decisions in the labor setting, and restricted legal procedure to labor laws (4:7).

Professional negotiations law. Professional negotiations law is interpreted as meaning Chapter 143 of the Public Laws of 1965, of the State of Washington.

Professional organizations. Throughout the study, reference will be made to the National Education Association (NEA) and its state and local affiliates, as well as sub-divisions of the NEA including the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA). The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and its state

and local affiliates will be referred to as a professional teacher organization which excludes supervisors, management, and, usually, principals from membership.

Teacher militancy. For the purpose of this study, teacher militancy shall mean the formation of teachers into organizations in order to protect, maintain, and enhance their professional position and growth.

Educational leader. The term educational leader will refer to those individuals who have been given special responsibility and authority above the classroom teacher as directed by the local school board policy.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

The remainder of the study will enlarge upon the following:

1. Chapter II will present the current literature available on the role of the principal. Information solicited from major educational groups, governmental publications, and labor reports will also be included to provide a historical background.
2. Chapter III will deal with a detailed discussion of the procedure employed to survey the attitudes of

principals concerning professional negotiations.

3. Chapter IV reports the findings of this study with an analysis of the data presented in table form.

4. Chapter V presents a summary and reports conclusions based on the problems suggested in Chapter I.

Suggested implications and recommendations for further study in respect to the involvement of the building principal and his role in professional negotiations will also be made.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Ample material has been written on the role of the superintendent, the position of the board, what is negotiable, and how to negotiate. One area of role responsibility has remained vague and undeclared. With the sudden surge of collective negotiations between school boards and the teacher organizations, the school principal has found himself to be the man in the middle (1:110). Morton Godine, a former teacher and presently in business management reported the principal's confused position by relating (18:35):

The school principal remains a key perplexing figure in this situation. His discretion and authority in hiring and firing would preclude him from union membership in private industry. If we define a principal, however, as an educator without teaching responsibilities he may reasonably be expected to support the instructional staff as its head teacher and stand with them in a representative capacity. This is perhaps an idealized view of a principal rather than the prevailing mode. In most instances, he remains an authoritative figure in the midst of a passive but increasing restive staff and to the extent that he is primarily a manager than an educator, the principal stands outside the proper scope of associational effort. As he assumes the role of a teacher without teaching responsibilities, his professional commitment would imply involvement and participation in the collective conduct of fellow teachers. The ultimate resolution of his status seems unclear at present and it is premature to seem to delineate his position in any categorical fashion.

A new role is emerging for the building principal. Any attempt to answer the questions and situations at hand by utilizing old role definitions would seem to be destined for failure. Lutz, Kleinman, and Evans assert the emerging new role of the building principal by suggesting (27:84):

... we can state the principal's position as follows: He is the one who (1) in terms of the school district, operates from a powerless base; (2) has been stripped of most of his leadership role by the central administration; and (3) does not participate in most of the decision-making that affects his building staff.

I. SIGNIFICANT HISTORICAL FACTORS

It has been generally believed that the struggle of teachers and teacher organizations to participate in the decision-making process was initiated in the early 1960's, in the New York school system. Actually, the evolution of teacher militancy had its conception in 1938, when the Educational Policies Commission suggested a philosophy for involving the total staff in school program development (43:6). Since the 1950's, surveys have shown that teachers are concerned about the autonomy of their work and wish to be part of the decision and policy making practices of the district they are employed (46:233, 37:11, 2:2929).

Although there are probably thousands of examples of some type of consultations between teachers and boards

of education over the past fifty years or more, the acknowledged breakthrough that served as a forerunner for contemporary bargaining... was the December, 1961, recognition of the United Federation of Teachers as the exclusive bargaining agent for public school teachers in New York City (36:3). Since then, a power struggle has been going on between the two teacher organizations, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers.

For many years the principal was characterized by varied images as Mr. Chips, the headmaster, the administrative mechanic, the change agent, and the leader. The National Association of Secondary School Principals has suggested what new directions might be implied (44:14).

... Pressures from..., teacher organizations, and federal and state government agencies are remolding this administrative position (the principal). This implies that the type of experience, professional preparation, philosophical outlook, and other qualities which were thought to be related to effective performance in past periods may not be appropriate measures of present challenges.

For direction, Bernard Watson strongly voices the way principals must turn their attention in finding a new emerging role (46:242).

... school administrators cannot afford to be in the untenable position of trying blindly to apply

traditional concepts to the new and changing circumstances. School administrators must reassess, and when appropriate, reshape and redesign their leadership role, using all the intelligence, insight, and understanding which can be brought to bear. Many old established traditions and processes will no longer suffice.

There appears to be no clear-cut pattern to situations that are changing the role of the building principal.

II. LEGAL STATUS OF PRINCIPALS

Whatever considerations are given to professional negotiations, it must not be overlooked that the process is affected by local and state laws concerning public education and public employment generally. In fact, much of the legal precedent bearing on the process has been drawn from the legal status of public employees, for, until recently, very few laws dealt specifically with the staff relationships of school employees.

There is no longer any real doubt that where there are no laws specially forbidding a school board to negotiate with the professional staff, it has the authority to do so, and that, legally, principals, with very few exceptions, may chart their own course as to whether they shall participate in the process on the side of the teachers or as representatives of the board.

Existing state laws vary considerably, however, on this matter.

The state of Rhode Island, for example, recently passed a statute defining principals and assistant principals as members of management teams, and as such, ineligible to bargain or negotiate against management (31:unpaged). The Michigan Labor Relations Board interprets its state statute as meaning the same thing (31:unpaged). The Wisconsin Employee Relations Board has determined that supervisors are agents of the employer, not the employee (or organizations). The Wisconsin law does not exclude principals from membership in teacher organizations nor accept that negotiations would of necessity conflict with supervisory responsibilities, but it does require each case to be evaluated in terms of ratio of supervisory membership to non-supervisory membership (31:unpaged).

Eight other states and the federal government have statutes or in the case of the federal government, an executive order providing for a form of professional negotiations suitable for representatives of teachers and boards of education.

California--any person except those elected by a popular vote or appointed by a governor.

Florida--shall include certificated personnel representing all work levels of such instructional and administrative personnel as defined in the school code.

Oregon--certificated personnel, below the rank of superintendent, have the right (to negotiate)... matters of salaries and economic policies affecting professional services.

Washington--includes any employee holding a regular teaching certificate and who is employed by any school district with the exception of the chief administrator (superintendent) of each local district (31:unpaged).

Most of the laws in the various states are quite liberal in defining the scope of what is negotiable. In Washington, for example, negotiations may include textbook selection, curriculum, in-service training, student teaching programs, personnel hiring, assignment practices, leaves of absence, salary schedules, salaries, non-instructional duties, and others (16:462). It is easy to see why principals have been concerned about the impingement on administrative responsibility that most of these matters touch.

The Connecticut statute provides for local associations to vote as to whether principals and supervisors should be part of the association's negotiation body (31:unpaged).

... in the final analysis, determination of the negotiation unit should be left to local preference, based upon what is the most desirable practice in view of unique local circumstances--not mandated by state legislation designed to regulate traditional labor-management relationships which have little or no applicability to education (43:163).

III. ARGUMENTS AGAINST PRINCIPAL'S MEMBERSHIP IN ALL-INCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING UNITS

A significant concern for principals has been their membership in association negotiating units. Should the principals as a group: (1) remain in the teacher organization as is the general practice now; or (2) form a separate organization at the local level; or (3) detach themselves completely from teacher affiliated organizations. This problem is not unique to education, and at first look the problem can be discouraging. Myron Lieberman and Michael Moslow have reminded us that there is no reason to expect educators and educational organizations, with their limited experience in collective negotiations, to come up with answers which have eluded everyone else (26:154).

Some areas of organization membership are clearly directed as can be seen from the language of Executive Order 10988, issued by President John F. Kennedy in 1962, where it was stated that (26:Section 6a):

Except where otherwise required by established practices, prior agreement, or special circumstances, no unit shall be established for purposes of exclusive recognition which include (1) any managerial executive, (2) any employee engaged in Federal personnel work other than in a purely clerical capacity, (3) both supervisors who officially evaluate the performance of employees and the employees who they supervise, or (4) both professional and non-professional employees unless a majority of such professional employees vote for inclusion in such a unit.

What has been of most concern to teacher organizations is the fear of administrative pressure and control of the negotiating units resulting in a conflict of interest. T. M. Stinnett presses this point by relating, "The plain fact is ... administrator inference and domination is all too prevalent in many associations" (42:335). It is reasonable to assume that tensions have and will continue to arise between teachers and administrators when they seek common points of view on matters which they have quite different attitudes.

It is perfectly understandable that principals have to consider their board responsibilities as delegated to them by the superintendent. The principal has been called

the superintendent's right-hand-man. This is most evident when noting that (3:10):

If every member of the administrative team played his role in expediting communication and mutual understanding, fewer matters would reach the negotiator's conference table; and even these would be disposed of more easily.

When examining the principal's role in such a manner that he is only carrying out the wishes of the board, it can be understood why it has been recommended that principals not only refrain from joining all-inclusive teacher organizations, but that they also not serve or have voting status in organizational units to which they may already have membership.

Benjamin Wolf's report to the Board of Education of New Rochelle, New York, had the following recommendation (47:3):

My experience leads me to recommend that administrative and supervisory personnel be excluded from the voting unit. It is in the arena of the conflicts between them and the teaching staff that the question of representation is most vital. At such times any question of ambivalence in the loyalties of the representative organization will plague the Board as well as the teaching staff.

Like almost everyone else, Calvin Greider believes that the superintendent must represent management--the school board. Greider contends that the superintendent must not face bargaining teams alone. Rather, the superin-

tendent should be at the head of the administrative corps of the school system, and his management team should include associate and assistant superintendents, directors of divisions and bureaus, and principals (19:6).

Some spokesmen on professional negotiations feel that the teachers should make the decision of the principal's future membership in association units. Benjamin Epstein has said (12:unpaged):

Increasingly, and very often with a paradoxical and nostalgic verbal apologia to their dedication to a community of educational aims and ideals using terms such as a "unified profession," the teachers, in trying to attain their goals come to regard the superintendent and the principal either as adversaries or impediments in their struggle for bargaining power. Sometimes with, but more often without rancor, they are coming to look upon the superintendent, the principal, and the remainder of the administrative-supervisory staff, less as colleagues, less as their educational leaders, less as patriarchal and venerable figures from whom to seek guidance and help, but more as managerial representatives of the employer who in this sense are barriers to the free exercise of their collective professional will.

In an open letter to Harold Spears, President of the American Association of School Administrators, Aaron Cahodes, editor of Nation's School, made this point explicitly when he stated (5:47-48):

NEA is as militant and strike-happy and sanction-oriented as are the teacher unions. Like teacher unions the NEA does not want administrators among its members. Unlike teacher unions, NEA is stuck with them. But not for long. Each year, NEA grows ominously close to

tossing them out. It has no choice. Supervisors, especially superintendents, not only represent management, they are management. To expect AASA and NEA to function sensibly as one organization under one roof is like expecting the National Association of Manufacturers to sign up as a division of the AFL-CIO. We should live so long.

Making this argument more specific, Epstein has stated that (12:unpaged):

... the principal... put into the position of assisting in the narrowing and lessening of his power to carry out the educational and administrative functions for which he is always held responsible not only by law but also by the school board and the community--functions which have been on the constant increase and need greater executive control.

No professional organization has put on record what role the principal is to play in negotiations. Rather, the principal has been ignored and overlooked. It has been observed by Luverne Cunningham that, "About all we can say definitely is that if the principal is to be heard, he must be heard as a member of the administrative team rather than as a spokesman for the teachers" (9:4). Before the impact of professional negotiations was felt in the State of Washington, Roald Campbell defined the role of the principal with his staff as being centrally orientated (6:234).

Because he is the principal he is expected to implement certain policy decisions made at the level of the central office and communicated to him... members of his own staff will expect him to implement policies and procedures which have grown out of staff discussions. In both cases he is to carry out organ-

izational imperatives, not his own personal wishes. To a very real extent the power resides in the office and not in the man.

The principal, however, will not wish to look at himself as an office. The principal has always been the educational innovator and a professional leader. When speaking about the Minnesota Teacher's Association having difficulties in determining membership, T. M. Stinnett related that, "Collective bargaining bars administrative and supervisory personnel from participating in the bargaining procedures" (42:122).

If the principal is to be barred from the teacher unit that he has aligned himself with in the past, it should be considered that principals ought to negotiate for themselves. Epstein described this feeling by stating (12: unpagged):

Principals are in both a philosophic and practical sense realizing that on a local level, while they have a great many common interests with teachers, nevertheless the pressure of teacher negotiations inevitably seeks to curtail their prerogatives, limit their authority while--never decreasing--but always increasing the principal's work load and responsibility. Principals are, therefore, questioning their own membership in local teacher organizations.... In most localities there has been no involvement of principals in the decision phases of agreement-writing, of the negotiations while the school board and superintendent find it expedient to yield to the duress of teacher pressures and keep principals away from the bargaining table. Under the circumstances principals and other administrators have begun to feel themselves in the

middle of a squeeze play in which the social needs and educational pressures of our time cause their responsibility and duties to be on the constant increase while their power and authority to bring their responsibility to successful fruition are either slowly or rapidly chopped away by the negotiations. It is not difficult to understand, therefore, that principals, especially those who are in larger school systems, have begun to discuss and to request negotiating privileges for themselves, and, in some cases, written agreements to protect their own status.

The arguments against principals' membership and participation in teacher organizations may be summarized as (1) a conflict of interests, (2) a feeling that principals are representing only the superintendent and the board, (3) weakening of the teacher organizations, and (4) a weakening of the principal's authority.

Benjamin Epstein has outlined the steps that principals could and should take (15:252-257).

1. Principals set up strong local administrative organizations, which can separately and distinctly present their views and protect their interests.
2. These organizations should become bold spokesmen.
3. Local and state NASSP organizations should campaign for funds to support good schools.
4. Principals should support the teachers' right to join or not to join teacher organizations.
5. Principals should acknowledge the teacher organ-

ization's right to negotiate.

6. The principals should continue to support the superintendent.
7. Principals must be integrated participants to the negotiations process at all times.
8. Principals must not hesitate to resist, interpret, and make known their opposition to any negotiated items.

If we are to agree with the comments of some writers, the position of the principal is very clear in relation to membership in teacher organizations. Doherty and Oberer put a dim cloud over the principal's future in professional negotiations by relating (11:123):

Administrators can be intimidated by teacher's threats to process grievances, and against their better judgment make assignments of certain teachers to special classes or to a particular type of extra duty because they wanted to avoid a troublesome grievance.

To many, the concerns of the principal's role is now insurmountable. The principal running his "tight ship," will find a caustic staff which is far more professional than any in the history of education in the United States, and in particular, the State of Washington. Epstein has reported that the principals position is going to undergo complete and drastic remodeling as a result of teacher militancy. The principal has already felt the pressures on

his previous authoritative position (15:239).

Agreements reached by negotiations have resulted in hampering the work of the principal and in spelling out certain school procedures in such ways as to diminish the discretionary authority of the principal to a point at which carrying out his responsibility and professional leadership have been dangerously impaired.

To others, the concerns against the principal's membership in an all-inclusive teacher organization may be subless and elusive.

IV. ARGUMENTS FAVORING PRINCIPAL'S MEMBERSHIP IN ALL-INCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING UNITS

As of June, 1967, thirty-four per cent of the nation's teachers were teaching in states which allowed negotiating privileges through professional organizations, unions, or staff representation. Myron Leiberamn has predicted that by 1972, eight per cent of the nation's teachers would be working under negotiation statutes and advised the public school administrators to take vigorous action to confront and prepare for the problems that will arise from professional negotiating actions by teacher organizations (26:168). Teacher organizations are asking for a greater voice on matters which include curriculum, staff assignments, and class loads. Such items infringe on the responsibilities that previously rested with the build-

ing principal. So far these demands seem to have been consistent with the school administration's overall objectives (10:523).

George Garver surveyed the attitudes of principals in Oakland County, Michigan, and found that the principals as a group did not feel that collective bargaining was especially harmful or detrimental to education. The principals did tend to have some serious questions, however, about the impact of collective negotiations on the role of the principal, but even these responses in general were not overly objective (17:3929). This was also pointed out in a study by Robert Maxwell in Flint, Michigan, dealing with elementary school principals (28:2950).

If principals are concerned about the effect of professional negotiations on their role, they must give serious considerations toward the working arrangements with their staff. Teachers and principals have had a common education and similiar experiences and as such should be able to work toward common objectives. Teachers and principals work for the welfare of the children they come to know.

A study by Norman McCumsey related that principals found themselves more involved with decision-making than

teachers even though a negotiating agreement was in their district. McCumsey's study also found that professional negotiations did not affect the needs of administrative personnel as has been stated by many writers (29:2951).

The NASSP has stated its position for the common objectives of the newly emerging role of the building principal (13:1).

The NASSP is convinced that the best education of our students demands a genuine working partnership of teachers, principals, superintendents, and school boards. This partnership must be characterized by devotion to common aims, by mutual respect, by continuous frank communication, and by thorough recognition by each of the contributions, problems, and responsibilities of the other.

The policy statement continues (13:6):

The counsel, criticism, and contribution of principals at the negotiating table can be invaluable to teachers, school boards, and superintendents in reaching decisions that can produce strongly a better school.... The members of the NASSP feel that principals and other administrative personnel must be included in every phase of collective decision-making where their fate and that of the schools for which they are responsible are to be determined.

The continuance of a working partnership between teachers and principals is sharply pointed out by John Hain and George Smith (20:18).

Standards and procedures for supervision should be developed jointly by administrators and teachers.... Principals should consult with senior teachers regarding reappointments. The old days of the principal with his teachers teaching in his school are being replaced by the principal and the teachers working together in their school.

It has been suggested that principals form a separate organization from the teacher groups to meet with the board. R. K. Ready in his book, The Administrator's Job, feels that splitting the teacher organizations and excluding principals will hinder the total educational process (34:37).

Separate organizations tend to keep separate. The administrator's dilemma is how to grant divisional autonomies in the organization and to assure strong interdivisional collaborations and necessary uniformities in practice for the whole organization.

T. M. Stinnett describes a consensus reached at a meeting on professional negotiations held in the National Education Association headquarters (41:30).

Recently we had a small "think" session on collective negotiations. In the group were several top-flight experts on industrial relations from leading universities. Two of the questions posed to these consultants were: Can NEA survive as an inclusive organization? Is there a professional, cooperative approach to professional negotiations? The answer was yes, and the conclusion was that administrative personnel can and should be "in" on every professional endeavor.

Many thoughtful spokesmen suggest that the role of the principal will be weakened by professional negotiations and that teacher organizations will suffer from the absence of principals if they choose to form a separate organization. Lieberman and Moskow see this in a somewhat different light and note that much can be gained by principals

remaining in the teacher organizations (26:168).

... teacher organizations may be strengthened instead by the inclusion of administrative personnel. The inclusion of administrative personnel may provide a united front which will increase organizational strength in negotiations or in dealing with the community. In addition, administrative personnel may be an important source of leadership for the organization. Perhaps the most accurate statement is that the inclusion of administrative personnel may simultaneously strengthen the organization on certain issues and weaken it on others. Thus the inclusion may strengthen the organization in dealing with issues on which teachers and administrative personnel agree, while at the same time it may weaken the organization's capacity to represent teachers on matters of disagreement between teachers and administrative personnel.

William G. Carr, past NEA Executive Secretary, made an appeal to principals at the NASSP convention in Cleveland on February 17, 1966, to remain affiliated with the "mother" NEA organization. Mr. Carr praised the principals for devotion to education in the past and related the close harmony that NEA and NASSP have experienced for fifty years. He suggested that it is essential that principals remain in the teacher organizations, and felt their roles would not be changed as a result of professional negotiations (8:53).

Since most negotiable items pertain to all professional personnel, no inherent conflict of interests is created by inclusive organizations. Even in the case of salary schedules, there is a tendency to include all personnel in a single structure, relating administrative and supervisory positions to the teacher's sched-

ule by means of ratios.... The relationship and role of the members of the teaching profession brought about by formal negotiation procedures at the local level should not cause us to try to reweave the whole fabric.

T. M. Stinnett speaks of this theme in a stronger note by stating that (42:339):

In the negotiating unit the superintendent is out. In all other matters of professional concern, both the superintendent and other administrative and supervisory personnel will be in. There is no good reason why the administrative and supervisory personnel (except the superintendent) cannot be included in the negotiating unit.

There are, as has been seen, a number of opinions of thoughtful spokesmen supporting the right of and the need for principals participating in the negotiating process and that professional negotiations may not have a marked effect on the role of the building principal. They hold, in summary, that principals and teachers are on the same team, that principals have responsibilities for the buildings in their charge, that principals can help teachers as the educational innovator of their buildings, and, that principals are entitled to the right to protect their own status and authority under the negotiating provisions.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY

It was indicated earlier that this study has been conducted in an effort to identify the attitudes of building principals toward their role as it may have been effected by professional negotiations.

To determine the attitudes of principals toward their possible role change, four areas were studied. These areas dealt with the principal's attitude toward his role changing, how his role might change, which groups of principals felt most threatened in their role by professional negotiations, and the direction the principal saw his future role.

It was assumed in this study that the four areas were a fair and representative sample of the attitudes of the building principals throughout first-class districts in the State of Washington toward professional negotiations and the building principal's role.

I. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The process of finding items for the questionnaire and developing the format proved to be a major task. Very

little has been written in relationship to the attitudes of building principals toward their role at the time of this study. The four areas of interest were decided upon as a result of correspondence with several educators, conversations and interviews with teachers and administrators, and the research of the limited literature.

A search was undertaken to find a questionnaire format suitable for the study. Appropriate books, theses, and journals were examined to determine the most feasible means of measuring the attitudes of the building principals. By offering five possible choices to each of the questionnaire statements, it was assumed that the principals selected in the study group would be more willing to respond to the statements. A combination of items found in the literature and adaptations of various feelings expressed in personal interviews resulted in the questionnaire used (Appendix B).

Copies of the questionnaire were mailed to one hundred fifty elementary and secondary principals from first-class districts in the State of Washington. The sample was determined by use of a table of random numbers (22:256-259).

The respondents were asked to first identify their

background and experience. Secondly, the respondents were asked to indicate their attitudes toward thirty statements. The thirty statements dealt with the four areas of interest that were indicated earlier. A rating scale was provided for each of the thirty statements and was designed to read from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with the statement. The respondents were also given the opportunity to answer an attitude of "undecided." It was assumed that an "undecided" response would be more significant than not responding at all to any one of the of the statements.

The questionnaire was mailed on September 20, 1968, and the principals were instructed to return the questionnaire by October 26, 1968, in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Following the collection of the data, conclusions were drawn in respect to the problems that were originally set forth in the study.

II. ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

The questionnaire responses were converted to key-punch cards and tallied on a sorting machine. The total responses for each statement were changed to percentages for easier analysis. By comparing the background and experience of various groups within the sample to the total

response, analysis was made as to whether background and experience were significant in relation to the responses made to the statements. It was assumed that responses to the statements were an indication of the attitudes that principals held toward their role and to professional negotiations. The results of the percentage analysis are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine what attitudes principals had toward their role as a result of professional negotiations in the State of Washington. Of the one hundred fifty questionnaires sent to randomly selected elementary and secondary principals, one hundred twenty-nine were returned for an eighty-six per cent response. The fact that a high percentage was returned in the one month time allowed would indicate that principals were interested in the topic and themselves in relationship to other principals throughout the State of Washington.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

The data used to classify principals in various categories and groups in order to make comparisons about the principal's attitudes toward their role and professional negotiations is shown in Tables I through V. Results of the general information are discussed in the following paragraphs and again in the attitude information results on pages 42 to 55.

Items 1, 2, and 3 of the general information sheet

were combined to determine two groups of principals in relationship to background and experience. In order to be classified in Group B, a principal had to have had seven or more years experience as a building principal and reached the age of forty. Seven years was selected as the minimum number of years of experience because of the New York teacher's strike in 1960. The New York teacher's strike of 1960, has been considered the first significant teacher militancy activity in recent years. Age forty was selected to correspond with the seven years experience that a building principal would have so that the principal would have had some experience as a classroom teacher.

TABLE I
CLASSIFICATION OF PRINCIPALS BY
EXPERIENCE AND BACKGROUND

Principals	Group A	Group B	Total	Percentage
Male	46	78	124	92
Female	0	5	5	33
Total	46	83	129	86

Table I, shows the number of principals in the two groups. There were forty-six principals with less than

seven years experience or who were less than forty years old. There were no female principals in Group A. Group B, had seventy-eight male and five female principals with at least seven years experience as a building principal and were forty years of age or older. The average age for all of the respondents was 47.1 years. The average years of experience for all of the respondents was 12.1 years.

There was no significant difference in responses on the attitude statements between Group A and Group B shown on Table VI, pages 43 to 47. (See Appendix C for the responses of Group A)

It is significant to note that only thirty-three per cent of the female principals returned the questionnaire as compared to ninety-two per cent of the male principals. Table I, page 34, shows the percentage of returned questionnaires. It must be assumed that female principals were not as concerned with the topic and with professional negotiations as were male principals.

It was felt that district student enrollment would be a factor in the attitude responses made by the principals. The first-class districts were divided into three sizes in order to make a comparison of attitude responses. Table II, page 36, shows the number of principals who

reported from districts less than 5000 students, 5000 to 14,999 students, and over 15,000 students. There were twenty-eight principals from districts of less than 5000 students, forty-eight principals from districts of 5000 to 14,999 students, and fifty-two principals from districts over 15,000 students.

TABLE II
NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS AND
THE SIZE OF DISTRICT
THEY REPRESENTED

District Size	Number of Principals
Less than 5000 students	28
5000 to 14,999 students	48
15,000 or more students	52
No response	1
Total	129

District size was not a significant factor in determining the attitude responses of the three district groups in comparison to the total response. (See Appendix D for the responses of the group which had 5000 to 14,999 students)

Table III, page 37, shows the grade level that the

principals reported for their buildings. Although the random sample selection favored the elementary principals, the total group was felt to be a true cross-section representing all principals in the State of Washington. It was felt that secondary principals would have stronger feelings about professional negotiations and its effect on their role than elementary principals. This was considered because a higher percentage of male teachers are teaching at the secondary level. An NEA opinion poll conducted from 1965 to 1967, showed that male teachers are more concerned and involved in professional negotiations than female teachers (40:85-86).

TABLE III
GRADE LEVEL REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS
FOR THEIR BUILDING

Grade Level	Number of Responses	Percentage
K - 6	84	65.1
7 - 9	20	15.5
10 - 12	8	6.2
Others	17	13.2
Total	129	100.0

The grade levels reported were eighty-four buildings with a kindergarten through grade six, twenty buildings with grades seven through nine, and eight buildings with grades ten through twelve. There were seventeen principals who reported a variety of grade levels. These included some principals who identified their buildings as a middle school, grades nine through twelve, and two buildings that were indicated as special education facilities.

There was no significant difference in responses for secondary principals from the total responses. (See Appendix E for the responses of the secondary principals)

It was felt that membership in professional organizations would have a significant effect on the responses made by the principals. Table IV, relates the professional organization membership reported by the principals.

TABLE IV
THE MEMBERSHIP OF PRINCIPALS IN
PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Organization	Number
NASSP	32
AASA	4
ASCD	17
APA	1
DCT	8
DESP	57
NEPA	15
AFT	0
NEA	127
WEA	127
NEA - WEA affiliate	112
Others	26

It is significant to note that fifteen principals who reported membership in the NEA and WEA did not state membership in the local NEA - WEA affiliate organization. This might be explained by the fact that the Seattle principals consider the Seattle Principal's Association as their local affiliate.

No principals reported membership in the AFT. As a result, it was not possible to make a comparison on the attitudes of principals toward NEA and AFT membership. All memberships in professional organizations that were reported are affiliated with the NEA or WEA.

Item 7, of the general information sheet is not reported (Appendix A). The item was difficult for principals to answer, and most responses were written in by the number of days worked. Only three principals in first-class districts reported they worked on a nine month contract. Nearly all other respondents indicated a contract of eleven months or two hundred days.

Items 8 through 12 of the general information sheet are reported in Table V, page 41. Each of the items was felt to have significance in relationship to attitudes that principals would indicate in their responses.

Only one principal reported that there was not a

negotiating procedure between the local school board and the teacher organization. At the time the questionnaire was answered, the Bellevue School Board had not as yet, recognized professional negotiating procedures.

One hundred seven principals (83 per cent) reported their salary was attached to the teacher's salary schedule, while twenty-two principals (17 per cent) indicated their salary was separate. The questionnaire did not ask the twenty-two "No" responses if they negotiated as a group with the board or with the superintendent. There was no significant difference in the attitude responses for the twenty-two principals who related that they were not attached to the teacher's salary schedule (Appendix F).

Two-thirds of the principals (66 per cent) said they were represented on the teacher's negotiating team during negotiation procedures. Table V, page 41, shows that there were forty-two principals (32 per cent) who were not represented by the teacher's negotiating team. When the attitude responses of the forty-two principals that were not represented were compared to the total responses, no significant difference was shown (Appendix G).

Table V, page 41, shows that thirty-eight principals (29 per cent) were from districts that had a levy failure,

TABLE V

NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS WITH REGARD TO SALARY
REPRESENTATION, DISTRICT LEVY FAILURE,
AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Item	Question	Yes	No	NR
8	Does the teacher organization of your district have a negotiations procedure with the school board?	128	1	
9	Is your salary attached to the teacher's salary schedule?	107	22	
10	Were principals represented on the teacher team in your district during negotiations procedures?	85	42	2
11	Did you have a levy failure in the past two years in your district?	38	90	1
12	Were you involved with a grievance procedure with one of your staff members in the past two years?	10	119	

in the past two years. It was felt that a levy failure might influence the attitude responses of the principals toward the thirty statements in a militant manner. There was no significant difference in responses for the principals who had a levy failure in their district in the past two years (Appendix H).

Only ten principals (7.7 per cent) reported they had been involved in a grievance procedure with one of their staff members. It was felt in this study, that the experience of a grievance procedure would have a significant effect on the attitude responses of the principals when compared to the total group responses. The responses of the ten principals who reported a grievance procedure experience are shown in Appendix I. There was no significant difference in the responses of the principals with a grievance procedure experience.

II. ATTITUDE INFORMATION

The principals sampled were asked to give their responses to thirty statements dealing with the principal's role and with professional negotiations. The principals could react to each of the thirty attitude statements by marking a rating scale that ranged from "strongly agree" to

TABLE VI
PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS TO
ATTITUDE STATEMENTS ON THEIR ROLE AND
PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

Statement		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	Principals should plan to continue membership in the local professional teacher organizations	54.2	26.3	10.8	3.1	2.3	1.5
2	The building principal has generally been the superintendent's right-hand-man.	18.6	52.0	6.9	17.8	3.9	.7
3	The principal is the educational leader and innovator of his building	48.0	45.0	3.9	3.1		
4	The American Federation of Teachers could do a better job of meeting teacher needs than the National Education Association			11.6	31.0	57.4	
5	Teachers are ready to make policy as a group.	4.6	34.1	34.8	21.8	4.6	
6	Professional negotiations is the most significant happening in education in the past twenty years.	13.2	33.2	24.8	24.0	3.1	1.5

SA = strongly agree
A = agree

U = undecided
D = disagree

SD = strongly disagree
NR = no response

TABLE VI (continued)

Statement		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
7	Teacher organizations have a purpose, but they are getting out of hand.	1.5	16.3	21.8	49.5	10.8	
8	Professional organizations are usually run by teachers who have an "axe-to-grind."	3.1	6.9	13.2	63.5	13.2	
9	Administrators in the past have dominated the local teacher organizations to the point of creating "company shops."	1.5	12.4	10.8	49.5	25.3	
10	Principals should form their own groups to negotiate with the board.	6.9	14.7	23.2	37.3	17.8	
11	The authority of the principal is being threatened by teacher militancy.	5.4	23.2	18.6	48.0	4.6	
12	Teacher militancy will create a wider opportunity for educational experimentation and growth.	.7	19.4	31.8	39.5	8.5	
13	Principals should be elected by the staff they serve.		.7	5.4	46.5	47.5	
14	Educators in the State of Washington are headed toward unionism rather than professionalism.	2.3	14.7	17.0	49.5	16.3	

TABLE VI (continued)

Statement		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
15	The primary concern of the local teacher organization should be the welfare of the profession.	11.6	31.0	13.9	31.8	10.8	.7
16	Teacher collective activity is in harmony with society's objectives for education.	3.1	33.2	33.2	27.9	.7	1.5
17	The principal should be represented by the local bargaining agent on salaries and ratios for principals.	14.7	59.5	12.4	13.2		
18	The local teacher organizations are usually operated by teachers most removed from the real objectives of education.	3.1	3.9	10.0	69.0	14.0	
19	Teachers have the moral right to strike.	6.2	27.0	17.8	31.0	17.8	
20	School administration is steadily moving toward the democratic concept.	6.9	62.0	17.8	10.0	1.5	2.3
21	What will happen to the role of the principal is going to happen and involvement by principals will have no effect.	.7	.7	7.7	56.0	32.5	1.5

TABLE VI (continued)

Statement		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
22	Professional negotiations have resulted in developing barriers between teachers and principals	3.9	20.1	20.1	49.0	6.9	
23	Educators should look at their fellow workers in terms of a genuine partnership.	55.0	43.5	.7		.7	
24	Principals should help to enforce the local agreements as a result of professional negotiations with fairness and vigor.	23.2	66.0	6.9	1.5		2.3
25	Teacher personnel files should be open and not confidential.	3.9	16.3	5.4	34.1	37.3	3.1
26	The classroom teacher has generally been subservient to the building principal.	2.3	49.5	12.4	26.2	8.5	.7
27	The paramount objective in education should be the welfare of the child.	71.4	28.6				
28	During candidate interviews, principals should ask prospective teachers about his or her feelings concerning teacher militancy.	4.6	27.0	22.5	33.2	12.4	

TABLE VI (continued)

Statement		SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
29	Teacher organizations have not communicated well with principals in the past.	4.6	34.1	13.9	44.2	3.1	
30	Principals will have to speak against teacher militancy and teacher organizations when the education of the student is hindered.	18.6	66.0	12.4	2.3	.7	

"strongly disagree." The principals could also mark "undecided" if they did not wish to take a position on any one of the statements. Table VI, pages 43 to 47, reports the responses made by the principals who returned the questionnaire.

It was stated earlier that this study was undertaken to examine the attitudes of building principals toward their role and professional negotiations. Four specific areas were to be studied. The areas of interest were (1) whether the principals saw their role changing, (2) how their role might change, (3) which groups felt most threatened, and (4) the direction principals saw their future role taking.

Is the principal's role changing? Principals indicated that they saw their role continuing as the educational leader and innovator of their building. To statement 3, ninety-three per cent agreed their educational leadership role would continue.

Approximately fifty-four per cent did not see their role being threatened by teacher militancy in responding to statement 11. Twenty-eight per cent saw their role being threatened, while a significant eighteen per cent were not certain if professional negotiations would change

their role through teacher militancy.

To statement 22, fifty-six per cent of the principals disagreed that professional negotiations had resulted in developing barriers between teachers and principals. Nearly one-fourth (24 per cent) of the principals, however, agreed with the statement. Nineteen per cent were undecided and had doubts as to whether barriers were being developed as a result of professional negotiations. Since nearly fifty per cent of the principals either agreed or were undecided about statement 22, it can be stated that half of the principals did not see barriers being developed, as yet, as a result of professional negotiations.

Statement 23, emphasized the principal's concern for trust and confidence between teachers and principals. Nearly all of the principals (98 per cent) agreed that educators should look at their fellow workers in terms of a genuine partnership. Such a regard for trust and confidence can be said to point out the concern by principals that professional negotiations might change their role in a negative manner. In the past, principals have enjoyed the position of working both with building staff and with the management team without too much conflict of interest.

As a companion aspect to statement 23, the principals were asked if they felt the classroom teacher has been generally subservient to the building principal. Interpretation of the statement was most significant, but, it must be assumed that the principals viewed their role as not changing in relationship to being the leader of their building. To statement 26, fifty-two per cent agreed that the classroom teacher has been generally subservient to the building principal, while thirty-four per cent disagreed. Twelve per cent marked undecided. It can be assumed that the principals marking the "undecided" had feelings that the subservient position of the teacher would change.

How principal's role will change. Nearly half of the principals (46 per cent) agreed that professional negotiations is the most significant happening in education for the State of Washington in the past twenty years. To statement 6, the remaining half of the principals equally disagreed or were undecided. Since nearly fifty per cent of the principals saw professional negotiations as an important agent in their role, it must be assumed that the principals saw professional negotiations as a means of changing their role.

Though principals saw their fellow workers as partners in education, the principals strongly disagreed that they should be elected by the staff they serve. Nearly all of the principals (93 per cent) disagreed with staff election for the selection of the building principal. Principals did not see their role changing as the building leader. To be elected by the teachers was a change that principals did not approve.

The principals did not see their role changing toward a management team concept as is found in industry. Statement 14, asked if educators in the State of Washington were headed toward unionism. There was a sixty-six per cent disagreement by the principals on the statement dealing with the term unionism. Sixteen per cent agreed with the statement while seventeen per cent were undecided. Though the seventeen per cent that responded "undecided" could have a profound effect on the percentage results, the sixty-six per cent disagreement must be considered as a denial by principals that their role will change toward a management team concept such as found in unionized industry.

Over two-thirds (69 per cent) of the principals saw their role as moving toward the democratic concept. In

statement 20, the principals emphasized their concern for a partnership in working with their staff members. The majority of the principals saw their role changing toward democratic decision-making. However, seventeen per cent marked "undecided" on statement 20. These respondents may have been concerned about their role changing from the building leader as was indicated in statement 14.

In contrast to statement 14 and 20, the principals agreed that they have been the superintendent's right-hand-man in the past. Statement 2, was agreed on by seventy per cent of the principals. Such an agreement would lend toward the management team concept and pointed out the problem principals are having in assessing the direction of their role change.

Groups of principals most threatened. There was no significant difference found when the responses of various groups were compared to the total responses. Such factors as sex, district size, grade level, salary attachment, grievance procedure experience, and administrative experience and background as a building principal, did not differ significantly from the total responses reported in Table VI, pages 43 to 47. The data for several groups that were

studied has been reported in the Appendix.

Direction for future role. Principals were in complete agreement when asked about their role in relation to the students they serve. To statement 27, all of the principals (100 per cent) agreed that the paramount objective of education was the welfare of the child. To support this, principals were asked if they would speak out if the education of the students was hindered by teacher militancy and teacher organizations. To statement 30, eighty-four per cent of the principals said they would speak against teacher organizations if the education of their students was hindered. It was assumed that the twelve per cent that marked "undecided" on statement 30, had doubts about the objectives of the teacher organizations.

There was an eighty-one per cent agreement that principals should continue membership in the local teacher organization. Nearly eleven per cent, however, were undecided as to whether continued membership was a future aspect of their role according to statement 1. To emphasize a continued membership in the local professional teacher organization, seventy-three per cent of the principals agreed that they should be represented by the local

bargaining agent on salaries and ratios as shown by statement 17.

Principals in the State of Washington had strong feelings about remaining in the local NEA - WEA affiliated teacher organizations. Though principals felt they would have to speak out against teacher activity if student welfare was hindered, the principals were willing to work with and for the local teacher organization. To statement 24, eighty-nine per cent of the principals agreed that they should enforce the agreements reached by professional negotiations procedures.

There was a fifty-five per cent disagreement that principals should form their own groups to negotiate with the board. The disagreement to form a separate group is an indication that principals felt continued membership in the local teacher organization was a part of their future role according to statement 10. There was a large percentage (23 per cent) that marked "undecided" concerning the formation of a separate group to negotiate with the board. It was assumed that the twenty-three per cent undecided responses were an indication of doubt that the local teacher organization would meet the needs of the building principal.

Statement 24, asked principals if they felt that their involvement would have any effect on their role change. Ninety per cent of the principals said that they must be involved in their own role change and that their involvement would have an effect on their future role.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was an attempt to identify the attitudes of building principals toward their role as a result of professional negotiations. The study was significant because of the general agreement on nearly all of the attitude statements of the questionnaire. When the areas of experience, grade level, district size, sex, salary attachment, levy failure, and grievance procedure experience were compared to the total responses of all of the principals included in the study, it was felt that different responses would be shown. The areas studied did not show a difference in attitudes toward the building principals role and professional negotiations. Such a finding can be suggestive that principals had a general agreement toward certain phases of professional negotiations and the role of the principal.

How professional negotiations will change the role of the principal and the form the principal's role will take has not been answered in this study. The study did point out the perplexity which principals are experiencing concerning their role as a result of professional negotia-

tions.

Many of the statements on attitudes were marked "undecided." Some of the statements were marked as high as thirty per cent as shown in Table VI, pages 43 to 47. The statements marked "undecided" by a high percentage of the principals tended to deal with the purpose of professional negotiations.

Chapter II, dealt with a discussion as to whether principals should be included in the local professional teacher organizations. The study showed that the majority of the principals in the State of Washington are members of an all-inclusive teacher organization and no principal indicated membership in the AFT.

The principals did not feel that the AFT could do a better job of meeting the needs of teachers. Since none of the sampled principals were members of the AFT, it was assumed that the principals rejected their future role as suggested by the arguments against an all-inclusive professional organization. The principals reported that they were not ready to form their own groups to negotiate with the board.

Benjamin Epstein reported that (14:5):

As teachers have pressed for their right to bargain,

they have seriously damaged their long-standing relationship with principals and other administrators. Administrators in many parts of the country have reacted to this trust by teachers by severing ties with local teacher organizations.

This study showed that principals in the State of Washington are not ready to sever their long-standing relationship with the local teacher organizations. The principals were in general agreement to continue their membership in the local teacher organizations and to support the local organization in its efforts and activities.

Principals felt very strongly about their fellow educators. The principals vigorously supported a continuance of a working partnership with their staff members, and noted that their role was moving toward the democratic concept. The principals, however, did not feel that teachers were ready to make policy with or in place of the building principal.

Conclusions. As a result of this study, the following conclusions are made:

1. Principals felt they should continue membership in the local teacher organizations and continue membership within the all-inclusive professional teacher organization.

2. The principals felt it was important to continue the harmonious partnership between teachers and principals.
3. The leadership role of the principal for his building is necessary in the educational process.
4. Professional negotiations has, as yet, not developed barriers between teachers and principals.
5. The purpose of professional negotiations has not been made clear in relation to the role of the principal.
6. There is a mutual understanding by principals that their role should not be altered by the professional negotiations process.

Recommendations. The following recommendations are made as a result of this study:

1. Educators are reminded that the first concern of the profession should be the welfare of the student.
Educators must not lose sight of the true purpose in the educational process--namely the education of the youngsters who attend the schools of the State of Washington.
2. The course of action that may be necessary might be to change the present Professional Negotiations Law for the State of Washington. At the time of this study,

only one organization could represent the employees of a local school district in the professional negotiations process. Altering the Professional Negotiations Law of 1965, may alleviate some of the concerns of the building principal. Such a change may also help principals make a decision about their future role.

Suggestions for further study. The following comments are suggested for further study and point out some of the limitations found in this study:

1. The same questionnaire sent to principals outside the State of Washington as a comparison study. The effects of unionism in the eastern part of the United States as well as variations in state law should result in different responses to the attitude statements.
2. Exclude from the questionnaire the "undecided" response. It was felt in this study that many principals chose the "undecided" response rather than make a decision about their attitude toward certain statements in the questionnaire. An attitude statement that is unmarked may have more meaning.
3. A random sample of second and third class district

principals be made as a comparison to the first-class district principals in this study. The principals from smaller districts and communities may see professional negotiations and its effect on the principal's role differently than the attitudes found for the first-class district principals sampled in this study.

4. Allow principals to react to a specific paragraph situation. A sample incident would be stated and the written reaction by principals would be classified into degrees of attitude responses.
5. Identify the harmonious relationship between teachers and principals that has been discussed in the literature and in this study.

The professional negotiations movement has caused considerable changes in the State of Washington's educational system in recent years and will probably cause many more. While there was not a clear indication of the principal's attitude about their role change as a result of professional negotiations in this study, it was apparent that the building principals were developing new attitudes of sophistication and mutual understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ackerly, Robert L. "Negotiations: Legal Implications," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52:110-116, May, 1968.
2. Archambault, Eldon D. "Teachers Role in School Policy Development." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 1967.
3. Becker, Harry A. "Role of the School Administrators in Professional Negotiations," American School Board Journal, 150:9-10, 1965
4. Blumer, Carl A. "An Appraisal of Teacher-Negotiations Effort As Perceived by School Superintendents." Unpublished Master's thesis, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington, 1966.
5. Cahodes, Aaron. "An Open Letter To Harold Spears," Nation's Schools, 78:47-48, May, 1966.
6. Campbell, Roald F., Cunningham, Luvern L., and McPhee, Roderick F. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Incorporated, 1965. 553 pp.
7. Campbell, William G. Form and Style in Thesis Writing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1954. 114 pp.
8. Carr, William G. "The Principal's Role in Professional Negotiations," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 50:45-56, April, 1966.
9. Cunningham, Luvern L. "Implications of Collective Negotiations for the Role of the Principal." Paper read before a Seminar on Professional Negotiations, Co-sponsored by the National Education Association and the Graduate School of Education, University of Chicago, August 3, 1966.

10. Doherty, Robert E. "The Impact of Teacher Organizations Upon Setting School Policies!" The Clearing House, 40:515-524, May, 1966.
11. Doherty, Robert E., and Oberer, Walter E. Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining: A Changing of the Guard. New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, A Statutory College of the State University, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, May, 1967. 139 pp.
12. Epstein, Benjamin. "A Principal Shares Some Thoughts; Collective Negotiations in Public Education." Paper read before a Meeting of the 104th Annual Convention of the National Education Association, Miami Beach, Florida, June 27, 1966, unpagued.
13. Epstein, Benjamin. The Principal's Role in Collective Negotiations Between Teachers and the School Board. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, 1965. 12 pp.
14. Epstein, Benjamin. What is Negotiable? Professional Negotiations Pamphlet Number One. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, 1969. 48 pp.
15. Epstein, Benjamin. "What Status and Voice For Principals and Administrators in Collective Bargaining and Professional Negotiations by Teacher Organizations?" The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 49:226-259, March, 1965.
16. Executive Order 10988. Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service. Washington, D. C.: The White House, 1962. pp 493-499, citing Collective Negotiations for Teachers.
17. Garver, George G. "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County, Michigan, Concerning Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1967.

18. Godine, Martin R. "Collective Negotiations and Public Policy, With Special Reference to Public Education." Readings On Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967. pp 27-36.
19. Greider, Calvin. "Superintendents Can't Face Union Bargaining Teams Alone," Nation's Schools, 78:6, July, 1966.
20. Hain, John H., and Smith, George J. "How Principals Rate Teachers," American School Board Journal, 155:18, February, 1968.
21. Hazard, William R. "The Legal Status of Collective Negotiations by Public School Teachers and Implications for Public School Administrators." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1966.
22. Levy, Sheldon G. Inferential Statistics in the Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1968. pp 267.
23. Langer, John H. "The Emerging Elementary Principals in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, 47:160-161, December, 1966.
24. Lehman, Robert H. "Collective Bargaining Under Michigan Statutes: A Case Study and Interaction Analysis of the Negotiations Between the Board of Education, Flint, Michigan, and Flint Education Association." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1967.
25. Lieberman, Myron. Education As A Profession. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1956. pp 540.
26. Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations For Teachers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966. pp 745.
27. Lutz, Frank W., Kleinamn, Lou, and Evans, Sy. Grievances and Their Resolutions. Dansville, Illinois: The Inerstate Printers and Publishers, Incorporated, 1967. pp 108.

28. Maxwell, Robert E. "Leader Behavior of Principals: A Study of Ten Inner-City Elementary Schools of Flint, Michigan." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1967.
29. McCumsey, Norman L. "The Effects of Professional Negotiations on Secondary School Principal's Decision-Making Functions," Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, 1967.
30. Michael, Lloyd S. "The Principal and Trends in Professional Negotiations," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 52:105-109, May, 1968.
31. Guidelines for Professional Negotiations. Office of Professional Development and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: The National Education Association, 1965. unpagd.
32. Payne, Stanley L. The Art of Asking Questions. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1951. pp 201.
33. Perry, Charles R. "School Board-Staff Negotiations," Teacher's College Record, 37:103-109, December, 1965.
34. Ready, R. K. The Administrator's Job. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967. pp 139.
35. Redfern, George B. Improving Principal-Faculty Relationships. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1966. pp 63.
36. Schmidt, Charles T., Parker, Hyman, and Repas, Bob. A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education. The School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Social Science Research Bureau, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1967. pp 85.
37. Sharma, C. L. "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrator's Notebook, 3(No.8):11, April, 1955.

38. Sherif, Caroly, Sherif, Muzafer, and Negugall, Roger E. Attitudes and Attitude Change. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1965. pp 264.
39. Shils, Edward B., and Whittier, C. Taylor. Teachers, Administrators and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968. pp580.
40. "Should Teachers Strike?" Today's Education, 57:85-86, September, 1968.
41. Stinnett, T. M. "The Hour That Is." Classroom Teachers Speak On Opportunity For Responsibility. Washington, D. C.: The National Education Association, 1966. pp 107.
42. Stinnett, T. M. Turmoil In Teaching: A History of the Organizational Struggle for Americas' Teachers. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1968. pp 397.
43. Stinnett, T. M., Kleinman, Jack H., and Ware, Martha L. Professional Negotiations in Public Education. New York: The Macmillian Company, 1966. pp 309.
44. "The Right Principal for the Right School." Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators of the National Education Association, 1967. pp 32.
45. Watson, Bernard C. "The Principal: Forgotten Man In Negotiations," Administrator's Notebook, 15:1-4, October, 1966.
46. Watson, Bernard C. "Role of the Principal in Collective Bargaining," North Central Association Quarterly, 42:233-243, Winter, 1968.
47. Wolf, Benjamin H. "Advisory Report to the Board of Education of the City of New Rochelle, Regarding the Proposed Representation Election Among Its Professional Employees." New Rochelle, New York: City School District of New Rochelle, 1964. pp 5.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

September 20, 1968

The implications of the professional negotiations process are enormous, but what role the building principal will assume is vague and confusing. In an attempt to identify attitudes of elementary and secondary school principals concerning their future role, a study is being conducted at Central Washington State College.

Information, by means of a questionnaire, is being sought from a group of principals selected at random. You are one of the persons selected and cooperation in completing the form would be greatly appreciated.

In no way will your name, or the name of your school district be mentioned in connection with reporting the results of the study.

A pre-addressed and stamped envelope is enclosed for your ease in returning the completed questionnaire. Please return the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. October 26, 1968, has been selected as the cut-off date for returned questionnaires to be tabulated.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. Mike Fankhauser

Thesis Committee

Dr. William Gaskell, chairman

Dr. George Grossman

Dr. Frank Carlson

APPENDIX B

ATTITUDES OF PRINCIPALS CONCERNING THEIR ROLE AS A RESULT OF PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Number of years as a building principal.
2. Years of experience as a classroom teacher.
3. Present age. Sex (circle) M F
4. What is the approximate student enrollment of your district?
5. What is the grade level of your building?
(example: K-6, 7-9, 6-12)
6. Check the following professional organizations to which you have membership.

NASSP	DESP	local NEA-WEA
AASA	NEPA	affiliate
ASCD	AFT	
APA	NEA	other
DCT	WEA	

7. Circle your contracted months as a building principal.
 9 10 11 12
8. Does the teacher organization of your district have a negotiations procedure with the school board?

 Yes No
9. Is your salary attached to the teacher's salary schedule?

 Yes No
10. Were principals represented on the teacher team in your district during negotiations procedures?

 Yes No

11. Did you have a levy failure in the past two years?

Yes

No

12. Were you involved with a grievance procedure with one of your staff members in the past two years?

Yes

No

II. ATTITUDE INFORMATION

Directions: Circle the symbol which best relates your attitude toward the statement. The scale is designed to read as follows:

SA strongly agree

A agree

U undecided

D disagree

SD strongly disagree

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|----|--|
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 1. Principals should plan to continue membership in the local professional teacher organizations. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 2. The building principal has generally been the superintendent's right-hand-man. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 3. The principal is the educational leader and innovator of his building. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 4. The American Federation of Teachers could do a better job of meeting the needs of teachers than the National Education Association. |
| SA | A | U | D | SD | 5. Teachers are ready to make policy as a group. |

- SA A U D SD 6. Professional negotiations is the most significant happening in education in the past twenty years.
- SA A U D SD 7. Teacher organizations have a purpose, but they are getting out of hand.
- SA A U D SD 8. Professional organizations are usually run by teachers who have an "axe-to-grind."
- SA A U D SD 9. Administrators in the past have dominated the local teacher organizations to the point of creating "company shops."
- SA A U D SD 10. Principals should form their own groups to negotiate with the board.
- SA A U D SD 11. The authority of the principal is being threatened by teacher militancy.
- SA A U D SD 12. Teacher militancy will create a wider opportunity for educational experimentation and growth.
- SA A U D SD 13. Principals should be elected by the staff they serve.
- SA A U D SD 14. Educators in the State of Washington are headed toward unionism rather than professionalism.
- SA A U D SD 15. The primary concern of the local teacher organization should be the welfare of the profession.
- SA A U D SD 16. Teacher collective activity is in harmony with society's objectives for education.
- SA A U D SD 17. The principal should be represented by the local bargaining agent on salaries and ratios for principals.

- SA A U D SD 18. The local teacher organizations are usually operated by teachers most removed from the real objectives of education.
- SA A U D SD 19. Teachers have the moral right to strike.
- SA A U D SD 20. School administration is steadily moving toward the democratic concept.
- SA A U D SD 21. What will happen to the role of the principal is going to happen and the involvement by principals will have no effect.
- SA A U D SD 22. Professional negotiations have resulted in developing barriers between teachers and principals.
- SA A U D SD 23. Educators should look at their fellow workers in terms of a genuine partnership.
- SA A U D SD 24. Principals should help to enforce the local agreements as a result of professional negotiations with fairness and vigor.
- SA A U D SD 25. Teacher's personnel files should be open and not confidential.
- SA A U D SD 26. The classroom teacher has generally been subservient to the building principal.
- SA A U D SD 27. The paramount objective in education should be the welfare of the child.
- SA A U D SD 28. During candidate interviews, principals should ask prospective teachers about his or her feelings concerning teacher militancy.

SA A U D SD 29. Teacher organizations have not communicated well with principals in the past.

SA A U D SD 30. Principals will have to speak against teacher militancy and teacher organizations when the education of the students is hindered.

APPENDIX C

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS WITH LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS EXPERIENCE AND UNDER FORTY YEARS OLD

Statement Number	SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	52.2	30.4	8.7	2.2	4.3	2.2
2	21.8	41.4	8.7	19.6	8.7	
3	56.5	41.4	2.2			
4			17.4	32.6	50.0	
5	4.3	50.0	28.3	13.9	4.3	
6	8.7	43.5	19.6	26.1	2.2	
7		17.4	19.6	50.0	13.1	
8	4.3	8.7	6.5	65.2	15.2	
9	2.2	13.9	15.2	43.5	26.1	
10	10.9	8.7	21.8	39.2	19.6	
11	6.5	21.8	10.9	56.5	4.4	
12	2.2	19.6	34.8	34.8	8.7	
13		2.2	8.7	41.4	47.9	
14	4.3	13.9	17.4	43.5	21.8	
15	8.7	32.6	15.2	32.6	10.9	
16		43.5	37.0	17.4	2.2	
17	10.9	58.7	10.9	19.6		
18	4.3	4.3	13.9	63.0	15.2	
19	8.7	24.0	24.0	24.0	19.6	
20	8.7	67.4	10.9	10.9		2.2
21			6.5	54.5	39.2	
22	2.2	19.6	24.0	45.7	8.7	
23	63.0	37.0				
24	28.3	58.7	2.2	4.3		
25	6.5	26.1	2.2	39.2	24.0	6.5
26	4.3	56.5	6.5	24.0	6.5	2.2
27	73.9	26.1				2.2
28	2.2	37.0	19.6	26.0	15.2	
29	4.3	45.7	13.9	34.8	2.2	
30	19.6	60.9	13.9	4.3	2.2	

APPENDIX D

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS FROM DISTRICTS WITH 5000 TO 14,999 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

Statement Number	SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	58.0	33.4	6.2	2.0		
2	12.5	68.7	2.0	14.6	2.0	
3	66.7	18.8	14.6			
4	6.2	35.4	35.4	14.6	8.3	
5	14.6	33.4	18.8	27.1	4.1	2.0
6		8.3	20.9	56.2	14.6	
7	2.0	4.1	14.6	58.3	20.9	
8		10.4	10.4	50.0	29.2	
9	2.0	14.6	29.2	35.4	18.8	
10	2.0	16.7	29.2	35.4	16.7	
11	4.1	23.0	39.7	27.1	6.2	
12		20.9	33.4	41.8	4.1	
13			2.0	54.1	43.7	
14	6.2	12.5	14.6	52.0	14.6	
15	8.3	31.3	14.6	35.4	10.4	
16	4.1	39.5	31.3	23.0		2.0
17	18.8	58.3	16.7	6.2		
18	4.1		12.5	66.7	16.7	
19	6.2	23.0	14.6	31.3	25.0	
20	6.2	62.5	12.5	14.6		4.1
21		12.0	4.1	64.6	27.1	2.0
22		18.8	18.8	58.3	4.1	
23	33.4	66.7				
24	25.0	66.7	6.2	2.0		
25	4.1	16.7	8.3	35.4	35.4	
26	2.0	50.0	23.0	18.8	6.2	
27	70.6	29.2				
28	4.1	33.4	23.0	31.3	8.3	
29	2.0	33.4	12.5	52.0		
30	14.6	75.0	8.3	2.0		

APPENDIX E

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS FROM SECONDARY GRADE LEVEL: GRADES SEVEN THROUGH TWELVE

Statement Number	SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	60.7	28.6	7.1	3.5		3.5
2	32.1	43.0	7.1	14.2		
3	57.0	43.0				
4			14.2	35.6	50.0	
5	7.1	14.2	39.3	32.1	7.1	
6	10.6	25.0	32.1	25.0	7.1	
7	3.5	17.8	25.0	43.0	10.6	
8		3.5	14.2	68.0	14.2	
9		14.2	10.6	60.7	14.2	
10	7.1	10.6	17.8	43.0	21.4	
11	3.5	28.6	21.4	43.0	3.5	3.5
12		7.1	32.1	46.5	14.2	
13		3.5	10.6	32.1	53.5	
14	3.5	17.8	17.8	39.3	21.4	
15	14.2	32.1	7.1	28.6	17.8	
16	3.5	25.0	32.1	39.3		
17	14.2	50.0	14.2	21.4		
18		3.5	7.1	71.5	17.8	
19	7.1	21.4	25.0	21.0	25.0	
20	3.5	54.5	25.0	7.1	7.1	
21			3.5	57.0	39.3	7.1 10.6
22	3.5	17.8	17.8	14.2	46.5	
23	39.3	53.5	3.5		3.5	
24	21.4	60.7	10.6			
25		3.5	3.5	46.5	39.3	
26		60.7	3.5	28.6	7.1	
27	57.0	43.0				
28	10.6	32.1	14.2	28.6	14.2	
29	7.1	28.6	14.2	43.0	7.1	
30	21.4	64.3	14.2			

APPENDIX F

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS WHO REPORTED THEY ARE NOT ATTACHED TO TEACHER'S SALARY SCHEDULE

Statement Number	SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	41.0	27.2	9.1	4.5	9.1	9.1
2	31.8	41.0	4.5	13.6	9.1	
3	59.0	36.3	4.5			
4			27.2	31.8	41.0	
5	4.5	36.3	45.5	4.5	9.1	
6	9.1	41.0	31.8	18.1		
7	63.6	18.1	18.1			
8	4.5	4.5	18.1	63.6	9.1	
9	4.5	9.1		50.0	36.3	
10	18.1	18.1	13.6	41.0	9.1	
11	4.5	31.8	9.1	50.0	4.5	
12		13.6	36.3	31.8	18.1	
13			9.1	36.3	54.5	
14		9.1	36.3	41.0	13.6	
15	9.1	41.0	18.1	22.3	9.1	
16		41.0	41.8	18.1		4.5
17	22.3	45.5	13.6	18.1		
18			4.5	81.8	9.1	
19	4.5	27.2	22.3	36.3	9.1	
20	13.6	68.2	13.6	4.5		
21			4.5	63.6	27.2	4.5
22		22.3	27.2	41.0	13.6	
23	45.5	54.5				
24	18.1	72.7	4.5			4.5
25	4.5	13.6	9.1	36.3	36.3	
26		50.0	13.6	22.3	13.6	
27	72.7	22.3				
28		13.6	22.3	45.5	18.1	
29		4.5	13.6	31.8	9.1	
30	18.1	68.2	13.6			

APPENDIX G

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS NOT REPRESENTED ON LOCAL TEACHER NEGOTIATING TEAM

Statement Number	SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	54.8	31.0	11.8	2.3		
2	16.6	40.5	9.5	28.6	2.3	2.3
3	54.8	42.9		2.3		
4			21.4	28.6	50.0	
5		28.6	31.0	31.0	9.5	
6	21.4	31.0	19.0	21.4	4.7	2.3
7	4.7	14.3	26.2	47.6	7.1	
8	4.7	14.3	16.6	56.1	7.1	
9	2.3	14.3	16.6	38.1	28.6	
10	14.3	14.3	16.6	33.3	21.4	
11	9.5	31.0	16.6	40.5	2.3	
12		7.1	40.5	38.1	14.3	
13		2.3	4.7	42.9	50.0	
14	2.3	21.4	21.4	47.6	7.1	
15	9.5	28.6	16.6	28.6	14.3	2.3
16	4.7	23.8	28.6	38.1	2.3	2.3
17	19.0	47.5	16.6	19.0		
18	4.7	7.1	14.3	68.0	4.7	
19	2.3	31.0	16.6	33.3	16.6	
20	9.5	56.1	9.5	14.3	4.7	4.7
21	2.3	2.3	14.3	56.1	23.8	
22	9.5	31.0	19.0	35.7	4.7	
23	52.4	42.9	2.3			2.3
24	16.6	68.0	11.8	2.3		
25	4.7	16.6	2.3	35.7	35.7	4.7
26	4.7	47.5	9.5	23.8	16.6	
27	76.3	21.4	2.3			
28	9.5	28.6	16.6	33.3	11.8	
29	11.8	28.6	19.0	38.1	2.3	
30	16.6	71.5	11.8			

APPENDIX H

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS FROM DISTRICTS WHICH HAD A LEVY FAILURE IN THE PAST TWO (2) YEARS

Statement Number	SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	47.3	44.7	5.2		2.6	
2	10.5	52.6	7.9	23.6	5.2	
3	36.8	58.0	2.6	5.2		
4			13.3	21.0	65.8	
5	5.2	29.0	39.5	15.6	10.5	
6	23.6	36.8	18.4	15.6	5.2	
7		21.0	29.0	31.6	15.6	2.6
8	2.6	10.5	7.9	63.1	15.6	
9	2.6	10.5	2.6	52.6	31.6	
10	7.9	15.6	18.4	47.3	10.5	
11	5.2	34.2	21.0	31.6	7.9	
12	2.6	13.3	31.6	44.7	7.9	
13			5.2	39.5	55.2	
14		18.4	13.3	52.6	15.6	
15	13.3	34.2	13.3	23.6	13.3	2.6
16	2.6	34.2	36.8	23.6	2.6	
17	15.6	55.2	18.4	10.5		
18	2.6	5.2	5.2	79.0	7.9	
19	7.9	36.8	15.6	18.4	21.0	
20	5.2	50.0	29.0	13.3		2.6
21			7.9	55.2	34.2	2.6
22		31.6	21.0	42.1	5.2	
23	31.6	68.4				
24	26.3	60.5	10.5	2.6		
25	7.9	5.2	5.2	55.2	26.3	
26	10.5	39.5	15.6	18.4	13.3	2.6
27	65.8	29.0	2.9		2.6	
28	5.2	21.0	10.5	42.1	21.0	
29	5.2	26.3	15.6	50.0	2.6	
30	13.3	71.0	10.5	2.6	2.6	

APPENDIX I

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES BY PRINCIPALS WHO HAD THE EXPERIENCE OF A GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE WITH ONE OF THEIR STAFF MEMBERS

Statement Number	SA	A	U	D	SD	NR
1	70	10	20			
2	20	70	10			
3	70	30				
4			20	40	40	
5			70	10	20	
6	10	50	20	20		
7	10	10	20	40	20	
8	10		10	50	30	
9		10	20	40	30	
10	10	20	30	40		
11	20	10		70		
12		20	20	50	10	
13				40	60	
14		20	10	60	10	
15		50	30	20		
16		50	40	10		
17		50	20	30		
18	10		10	80		
19	20	10	10	20	40	
20	10	70	10	10		
21	10			60	30	
22	10	10	30	40	10	
23	10	90				
24	20	60	10			10
25	10	10	10	20	40	10
26		50		40	10	
27	70	30				
28		20	10	60	10	
29	10	10	20	60		
30	20	70		10		